THW

MAR 0 8 2007

40 High House Drive
Birmingham
B45 8ET

February 26, 2007

United Kingdom

Mail Stop Petition Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria Virginia 22313-1450 U.S.A.

Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.181

Application No. 10/521,307

Filing Date: January 13, 2005

For: Continuous Steelmaking Plant

This is a request for reconsideration of the decision to dismiss the Petition filed December 2006 to withdraw the holding of abandonment of the above-identified application

Your letter 9 February correctly indicates that "the petitioner has filed several applications ..." I was relieved to read this, because on 15 August 2006 I posted two items via Royal Mail "Airsure" to the US Patent Office relating to a request to begin national examination procedures for PCT/GP 2005/002130. According to Airsure both items were delivered before 13.09 on 22/08/06. I have received absolutely no communication from the US Patent Office regarding these letters. However, my credit card statement records a transaction dated 07 September, in which the equivalent \$630.00 was paid out to US Patent so I naturally assume that both items posted were actually received. Unfortunately, I made a similar assumption that there would be no acknowledgement or other communications for some months after I posted the response to Examiners Report relating to the aboveidentified application posted in the UK with Airsure on 2 May 2006 and addressed to Mr Scott Kassler. I am enclosing a further set of all the documentation sent to Mr Kassler on the aforementioned previous occasion. I believe the more recent experience outlined in this paragraph concerning lack of communication and its consequences is analogous to the chain of events relating to the above-identified application and thus is highly relevant to the present Renewed Petition.

For the record, Dr David I Ward submitted the original PCT Application through Marks & Clerk, chartered patent agents. Accordingly, the claims objected to by the Examiner were in fact composed a UK professional patent agent. I telephoned Dr Ward and sought his advice, which resulted in an exchange of emails, copies of which are enclosed with this reconsideration request. You will note that the email response shown on the attached page is dated 2 May 2006. This is precisely the same day that I despatched my response to Mr Kassler by post.

In view of the above, I categorically state that there is no possibility that the posted material in question was anything other than the formal response to the Examiner, a copy of which as already stated is enclosed with this request.

I am at a loss of what else can be stated at this stage and hereby submit my request for reconsideration of my Petition to withdraw the holding of Abandonment.

Dr. Noel A Warner Emeritus Professor

Enclosure 1. Emails exchanged between Petitioner and Marks & Clerk, concerning the substance of Enclosure 2, dated 2 May 2006.

Enclosure 2. Letter and Documents posted to Mr Scott Kassler dated May 2, 2006